

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 16, 1987

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, in whose strength is our strength and in whose promise is our hope, we remember those held hostage in our world. We pray that Your still, small voice will be heard above the clamor of threats and conflict and give to each person in need that peace that passes all human understanding. We also remember in prayer the families of those who know not the liberties we enjoy. Give them the gift of faith and hope and love and make Your presence a living reality in their lives.

This we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLIGHT OF HOMELESS CHILDREN

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, this day brings an alarming report to my attention in terms of the USA Today newspaper. It reveals a study that was done by the Child Welfare League of America and the Travelers' Aid International that demonstrates and answers the question as to who are the homeless in our society.

What this study points out is that for every 10 adults that are homeless 8 children are homeless, Mr. Speaker, and the average of these homeless children is 6 years of age.

In years past, a great leader from my State, the late Hubert H. Humphrey, pointed out that a society and a government is judged on how it treats the most vulnerable at various stages in life. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that this House in the past couple of weeks has answered this particular problem, I think, in a meaningful way. Our job is not done, but we have provided some help and some assistance on an urgent basis for the homeless for these children that are affected most dramatically in this way. We must convince our colleagues in the other body that that action is necessary and we must take further action in putting really

the money to the goals that we set forth in that bill for the homeless.

I hope that my colleagues that have been asking who are the homeless, are they the deinstitutionalized, are they people with an abuse problem on the streets, will contemplate for a moment and recognize that such a significant number of these are the youth of our society, those that I think all of us would take to our breast and would shelter from the type of harm that occurs when they do not have the barest necessities of life.

So we need to solve this problem in a cooperative way.

Mr. Speaker, I commend you and others in this House who have championed this cause, and I suggest that we ought to be forthright in pursuing this and resolving this issue so that we can provide these children with some hope, and avoid the deep scars that invariably will occur if we do not address this particular problem.

[From USA Today, Mar. 16, 1987]

"It's SCARY at NIGHT"; "I Miss My Dog"

(By Christopher P. Winner)

Jammie and Rene Smith are identical twins who share an identical fate—they are homeless.

The 8-year-old girls live in the Bible Tabernacle Shelter in Venice, Calif. With them are 100 other children plus single parents and families.

"I miss my dog Jackie. I really get scared when the lights are out," says Jammie. Rene sleeps with her cat, Ellie. "She makes me feel warm."

Farther north at Rafael House in downtown San Francisco, 2-year-old Elizabeth Mitchell grips her Cabbage Patch doll. Gina Roy, 23, Elizabeth's mother, has been homeless and jobless since being evicted from her Pittsburg, Calif., apartment five months ago. Elizabeth has been acting up.

"Elizabeth is not the type to normally slap people in the face, say 'no' to me," says Roy. "She doesn't have a stable environment, a place that she knows she lives."

A report released today by the Child Welfare League of America and Travelers' Aid International says homeless children and their families are increasing throughout the USA. The study notes that for every 10 homeless adults, 8 children were affected. Average age: 6.

Congress is listening. The report comes less than two weeks after the House passed an authorization bill for \$725 million to aid the homeless. The Senate is expected to address the issue by month's end. Funding for the House bill is pending.

About \$500 million would go to 10 programs now, including shelter, food and health care, and the remaining \$225 million would be spent over four years.

Despite congressional movement, the study's findings are stark.

One hundred sixty-three families interviewed from October through December

1986 had 331 children with them and 73 children living elsewhere, most with a former or current spouse. The 404 single adults interviewed had 103 children elsewhere, most staying with a spouse or relatives.

It is based on data from Travelers' Aid agencies in Detroit, Milwaukee, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Houston, Tampa, Fla., and Washington, D.C. Travelers' Aid is a national social service organization with agencies in 43 states.

The study, being released in Washington at the national conference of the Child Welfare League of America, found among the children:

43 percent who were school age did not attend school.

10 percent needed health care.

10 percent were suspected of being abused and/or neglected—three times the national average.

27 percent spent the previous night with friends or relatives, 21 percent had stayed outside, in a car or at a bus or train station and 25 percent had been in an emergency shelter.

Says Rep. Bruce Vento, D-Minn., active in pushing a House homeless bill: "It is surprising. It is disappointing . . . This study indicates the serious impact homelessness has on the most vulnerable people in our society—kids. They didn't choose this type of life. The programs we're proposing will help."

But when?

"Our concern is the long-lasting impact homelessness has on a child's development. For most of them, it occurs during their prime developmental years when they are doing the most changing and growing," says Dr. Judy Hall, executive director of Travelers' Aid International.

Repeatedly, the children stand out, telling tales that sit precariously between fear and hope.

Says Andy Mills, 7, at the Bible Tabernacle Shelter: "It's scary at night here. Every time I go to the bathroom, I see a globby monster with a big head and a big body. My sisters are here too. Lisa is 8, and Christina is 3. My dad is black and my mom is Korean. I would like to live in a house with a swimming pool."

But swimming pools are a dream away. Rafael House, run by the Holy Order of Mans, opened in 1977. It takes in families and holds 50 people in separate rooms. Currently, there are about 35 people, including 20 children, from infants to 14. Most are between ages 2 and 6.

"This is as close to home as you can get in an emergency crisis," says the Rev. David Lowell, chaplain.

The Bible Tabernacle Shelter is also church-run. Most of the children in the facility sleep on pews or on mattresses on the floor. Children fight, but "it's better than them sleeping in the streets. For the most part they get along great. A lot of friendships are made," says Lori Lanthier, daughter of the Rev. Fred Hilst, both volunteers at the shelter. She estimates 300 reside in the shelter, 100 of them children.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

In Detroit, brothers Roderick, 10, and Dedric Jackson, 7, from Birmingham, Ala., live at St. John's Congregational Church, which sees that they go daily to nearby Irving Elementary School.

The brothers moved around the city quite a bit. One of their homes burned down. Young Dedric woke up during the night and saved his mother and brother from the fire. Robbed and severely beaten 18 months ago, mother Rosa Jackson, 31, has a large scar dividing her forehead and is blind in her left eye.

Roderick wants to go home to Birmingham where, he says cheerfully, "all I had to do to see my grand-daddy was walk one block this way and one block that way."

Maria Foscarinis, spokeswoman for the National Coalition for the Homeless, an advocacy group that includes shelter providers, says the House bill "is an urgent measure to provide basis assistance immediately. It'll provide money for emergency shelter and health care. It would address some of the emergency shelter needs of kids."

"These children represent a growing national tragedy and that doesn't say anything about the mothers—they're young, too," said Dr. Ellen Bassuk of Harvard Medical School.

The average age of mothers surveyed in an eight city study by Traveler's Aid and the Child Welfare League of America was 29.

Gerri Reuber, 31, mother of twins Jammie and Rene, and two other children, Jason, 13, and Naomi, 16 months, has been living at the Tabernacle for six weeks. "I got involved in drinking and drugs to where I took away from my own children," she says.

"When we brought them (the children) here, their behavior is a lot better. They used to be very disobedient, very hard to control and I let them go. Disciplining me helps me discipline them. My oldest takes it as being a lot better than being out in the street."

At Lieu Cap, another shelter in Venice, Calif., Duane Styles, 8, one of three brothers, tries to look to the future: "I'd like to go back to Lincoln, Neb. But if I can't, I'd like to move into Michael Jackson's house."

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FOR A BALANCED FEDERAL BUDGET

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today State senators in the great State of Montana will be asked to take another step in the long journey toward forcing us in the U.S. Congress to balance the Nation's books.

The Montana Senate's State Administration Committee will vote on a resolution calling for a Constitutional Convention to propose an amendment requiring a balanced Federal budget. A similar measure passed the State house last month.

That means that if the full senate approves the measure and the Governor signs it, Montana will be the 33d State to call for such a convention. That would be just one short of the number of States required to force a Constitutional Convention.

Together with 13 other new Republican Members of the House, I have written Montana legislators urging them to press for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

With recent annual deficits in excess of \$200 billion, the reason for such a measure is clear. Despite our rhetoric, we still have not been able to make the tough choices that will bring our spending in line with our revenue.

My freshman colleagues and I support the efforts of Montana and the other States in the fight against deficit spending. But their efforts should not absolve us from quickly seizing control of our own problem and proposing a balanced budget amendment of our own.

THE ABM TREATY

(Mr. DICKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my appreciation for the detailed analysis that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] has provided the Congress with respect to the true application of the ABM Treaty to the type of systems being researched under the strategic defense initiative. His study is comprehensive and conclusive, there is no basis for the claim made by the administration that the treaty does not prohibit the development and testing of exotic technologies that are sea based, air based, space based, or mobile land based. I include in the Record an editorial from yesterday's Washington Post on this issue.

This is an important issue because of its implications for our arms control policy and overall national security. But it is even more important because of its potential precedent for all treaties. We are a nation governed by laws, not men. Yet, the effort has been made to unilaterally restate the application of the ABM Treaty, counter to the negotiating record, subsequent practice, and representations made to the Senate during the ratification process. If we allow this to take place, the integrity of the entire treaty-making process would be seriously undermined.

Judge Sofaer is now reexamining aspects of this issue. I hope that he will on this occasion make an objective review of the record, not try to build a case on bits and pieces that are construed to support a predetermined conclusion. Frankly, his initial analysis raises serious questions of integrity in the research process.

Ultimately, the executive and the Congress will have to decide together how we wish to proceed with respect to strategic defenses and the ABM Treaty. But, to unilaterally change the

interpretation of this treaty, in my mind, is a serious mistake, and I believe that the administration will be better served if, after consultation with the U.S. Congress and the other body that it continues to abide by the restrictive interpretation which was clearly what the other body ratified on this issue. I think the administration will do better in terms of this effort to present the SDI Program to the Congress if it follows the narrow, restrictive interpretation.

The editorial referred to follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 15, 1987]

SENATOR NUNN AND THE ABM TREATY

Sam Nunn's care in defense analysis and his political deftness have established him as the one legislator who can single-handedly validate a moderate position. So everybody quieted down when he took the floor on three consecutive days last week to speak on the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. It was a political event. On a seemingly arcane issue of treaty interpretation may rest the prospects for Soviet-American relations over the next few years.

Sen. Nunn plowed through the Senate's ABM ratification hearings, the subsequent practices of the two superpowers and the original negotiating record between them. He said he would be guided by the record. He demolished the administration's retroactive 1985 reinterpretation, which would have permitted more expansive testing of the Strategic Defense Initiative. In the process he laid claim to the position and intent of the late senator Henry Jackson—the same person the administration claims as patron of its treaty reading. He savaged—there is no other word—the handiwork of the principal presenter of the new reading, State Department counsel Abraham Sofaer, who ended up disavowing his key 1985 memorandum, attributing it to "young lawyers" on his staff.

The debate over the ABM treaty may go on for a bit. But it would seem the administration has lost for good the legal basis on which some officials have been arguing for more aggressive SDI testing and for an early start on SDI deployment. With the first or "traditional" interpretation reaffirmed, the administration is in a position to move forward in a measured way on SDI research and development and to stay engaged with the Soviet Union on negotiations on strategic offensive and defensive arms.

Will the administration go this way? Presumably, Mr. Reagan's new White House team can see the advantages. And they don't exactly need an ABM reinterpretation battle. Given the effect of the Iran-contra affair, the administration could have beat down Congress only at a prohibitive political cost. And were it to sustain and act on its reading, Sen. Nunn believes, it would still lack the authority needed to proceed toward early deployment. An accommodation with Congress can leave Mr. Reagan with enough legal room to conduct the SDI work that was logical and feasible in the first place.

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE
ON PUBLIC WORKS AND
TRANSPORTATION TO FILE
CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R.
2, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION
AND UNIFORM RELOCATION
ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1987**

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation may have until 6 p.m. today, March 16, 1987, to file a conference report on H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987.

Mr. Speaker, I state further that this has been cleared with the minority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENNETT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

**COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC, March 12, 1987.

HON. JIM WRIGHT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House at 12:14 p.m. on Thursday, March 12, 1987 and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits proposed legislation entitled, "Federal Credit Reform Act of 1987."

With great respect, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

**FEDERAL CREDIT REFORM ACT
OF 1987—MESSAGE FROM THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 100-50)**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; the Committee on Government Operations; the Committee on Rules; the Committee on Ways and Means; the Committee on Education and Labor; and the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of Thursday, March 12, 1987, at page 5598.)

□ 1220

**THE BERNE CONVENTION
IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 1987**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago Congress passed the Copyright Act of 1976, the first general revision of our copyright law since 1909. We did so only after years of work—starting in the early fifties, continuing with 22 days of hearings and 51 days of markup in 1965, and ending with 17 days of hearings and 25 days of markup in 1975-76. I committed much of my first 18 years in Congress to this endeavor.

The Copyright Act of 1976 was a bipartisan legislative achievement of the first magnitude. Legislators of both parties understood that copyright legislation raises unique difficulties. While a relatively obscure discipline, copyright touches every American in their homes, schools, libraries, and workplaces. Determining the scope of a law which deeply affects how all of us may enjoy books, films, television programming, computer software, information products and services, music, and the visual arts requires great caution, particularly in a rapidly changing society such as ours that seeks both the free flow of information and the free marketplace.

With the memory of the 1976 revision still fresh in mind, I am introducing legislation today to amend the 1976 Copyright Act. Although narrow in scope and seemingly technical, these amendments contemplate fundamental changes in our copyright system. My legislation responds to the same "brooding presence" that has lurked in the background of U.S. copyright legislation for 100 years—the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. In many ways we drafted and passed the 1976 act with a weather eye on Berne. The bill I introduce today—the Berne Convention Implementation Act of 1987—removes from law provisions incompatible with the proscriptions of the Berne Convention—as revised at Paris on July 24, 1971—and adds to our law provisions required by that convention not now present in the statute.

The objective of the bill is simple: To permit the adherence of the United States to the Berne Convention, if, after hearings and consultations, we determine that Berne adherence on balance serves the interests of this country and its citizens. I am honored to have Mr. MOORHEAD join me as a cosponsor. This kind of bipartisan tradition reaches back to the 1976 act. I am aware of the administration's conceptual support for adherence to Berne

and I look forward to working together with the executive branch on the implementing legislation. I also anticipate a close working relationship with the World Intellectual Property Organization [WIPO] and its director general, Dr. Arpad Bogsch, on this important subject. In preparing this bill, I have been guided by the hard-learned lessons of history—both the history of our domestic copyright revision struggles and that of our several unsuccessful efforts in the past to adhere to Berne.

My bill is based, in part, on the toil of the Ad Hoc Working Group on U.S. Adherence to the Berne Convention. I would like the record to reflect the hard work of the members of that group, and in particular those of its chairman, Irwin Karp, and of its guiding hand in the executive branch, Harvey Winter, from the Office of Business Practices in U.S. Department of State. I would be remiss if I did not mention the efforts last Congress of Senator Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., who introduced similar legislation in the Senate.

Like our law, the Berne Convention has changed over time. Its 76 adherents now include most of the industrialized world, a number of developing countries, and a few nations in Eastern Europe. The United States, the Soviet Union, and the People's Republic of China do not adhere. The United States and the Soviet Union along with another 76 nations, belong to a more recent treaty, the Universal Copyright Convention [UCC]. Both treaties are administered by United Nations organizations: Berne by the World Intellectual Property Organization, and the UCC by Unesco. The United States has a seat on the committee that oversees the UCC, but, since we withdrew from Unesco, we have a smaller voice, and no formal vote, in the overall planning and budgeting process affecting UCC-related activities.

Many nations adhere to both treaties, and the United States enjoys copyright relations, either through the UCC, or a formal bilateral relationship, with almost 100 states. If we adhere to Berne, we gain or clarify or improve our relations with 24 nations that adhere to Berne but not the UCC, and with whom our copyright relations are now nonexistent, unclear, or otherwise problematic.

The interest in adherence to the Berne Convention that sparked this initiative is rooted in part in the desire to promote the international protection of works of American authors. This arguably would be achieved, by having the United States embrace particular legal rules accepted by 76 nations, including our major trading partners in Western Europe, Canada, and Japan. But we now have copyright

relations with most, if not all, of these states by virtue of the Universal Copyright Convention; and, Berne membership would not, by itself, increase the level of protection we now enjoy in those states.

Upon closer scrutiny, the benefit most frequently pointed to in support of United States adherence to the Berne Convention appears to be enhanced political credibility in our global effort to strengthen copyright norms, to suppress piracy, and to secure in all the countries of the world a realistic minimum standard of protection for creative works. A major forum in which this policy objective is being sought is the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT], where we are seeking the adoption of a code or standard of conduct relating to protection of intellectual property within the GATT. For copyrights, that standard or code may well be the minimum economic rights of the Berne Convention. And, if we join Berne, our trade negotiators around the world could insist on these standards as those that constitute adequate protection for GATT as well as bilateral purposes.

While we all agree that protection of our creative works abroad is often inadequate, everyone does not agree that this is the case with respect to our own works under our own copyright law. We are nevertheless being called upon to modify the equilibrium of our domestic copyright law in order to help secure better protection for our authors in other countries. We want to protect and promote the copyright export earnings of U.S. industry, but we should not do so at the expense of the unique needs and traditions of our society and our preferences as to the proper mix of rights, limitations, and conditions we have come to rely on over the years.

The legislation I am introducing today seeks to raise all of the questions that must be asked for the full range of private and public interests to be aware of what Berne adherence will mean now and tomorrow. The goal of the bill is to stimulate debate about the issues and to further understanding about the Berne Convention in a democratic and open setting. I have never seen a copyright bill that failed to evoke some controversy, and this one will be no exception. It will stir debate within the framework of full public hearings, and give my subcommittee—the Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties and the Administration of Justice—the information it needs to decide how to proceed. The bill is a first draft and undoubtedly will undergo refinements.

The United States chose not to join the Berne union in the past because we did not then want for our society the kind of copyright laws that the convention required. A fresh look is

needed, and I encourage my colleagues to do so.

This legislation was drafted after assessing both the level of Berne obligations under the current Paris act, conscious of the practices of those states party to Berne at a similar stage of development as the United States that generally share our values of free speech and artistic freedom. Also examined were the literally dozens of bills introduced over the last 60 years to bring the previous copyright laws into conformity with Berne. Conforming our law with Berne may not involve many major changes to the Copyright Act of 1976; it will, however, require Congress to move that act a few inches further along in several areas where the 1976 act stopped just short of a point of Berne compliance. We may also have to add a few rights proposed, but not accepted, in the 1976 revision. The ultimate political question may become whether or not the country is prepared to accept copyright notions that were unacceptable scarcely a decade ago.

Copyright experts disagree on the extent to which we have to change current copyright law. Whatever the case, none of these experts has testified before my subcommittee. I look forward to giving them this opportunity in the very near future. Serious issues must be confronted. For example, adherence to Berne will require the elimination of the formality of the copyright notice; and, perhaps more importantly, will preclude the future conditioning of the existence of the author's copyright upon any sort of formality. Many will feel this to be a just and long-overdue step; some will have doubts. Everyone must consider, however, whether the elimination of such formalities upsets the balance of rights and privileges copyright proprietors now live under and of which formalities have long been a part. Berne also appears to require some modification of the compulsory license for the public performance of music on so-called jukeboxes. Finally the moral rights section of the bill will engender lively debate.

In order to examine the Berne issue with some specificity, I am proposing a bill that would, if enacted, clearly place U.S. law in substantial compliance with the provisions of the treaty. My bill errs on the side of legislating compliance with Berne rather than remaining silent on the issues. During the hearing process, the subcommittee we will learn whether all of the proposed amendments are necessary and desirable, whether the treaty compels other changes as well, and whether adherence to the treaty is worth the price.

The proposed legislation clearly proceeds upon the presumption that the Berne Convention is not self-executing and requires implementing legislation.

There is, as well, serious doubt as to whether copyright treaties such as the Berne Convention are constitutionally susceptible of self-execution in any event. Under article I, section 8 of the Constitution, the power to enact this Nation's copyright and patent laws is allocated exclusively to the Congress and this power is not diminished or qualified by any potential executive authority to conclude international copyright arrangements under which all or part of those benefits are extended to foreign nationals and their works.

Let me now turn to a description of the bill. It contains 16 sections.

Section 1 of the bill sets forth the short title: the "Berne Convention Implementation Act of 1987."

Section 2 provides, for drafting clarity, that whenever in the proposed legislation an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 17, United States Code.

Section 3 sets forth several congressional declarations, including: First, that the Berne Convention is not self-executing under the Constitution and laws of the United States; second, that the proposed legislation together with current law, will enable the United States to meet its obligations as a nation adhering to the Berne Convention and no further legislation will be needed; and third, the provisions of Berne shall be given effect under title 17, United States Code as amended, and shall not be directly enforceable in any action brought pursuant to the provisions of the Berne Convention itself.

In section 4, the bill would modify chapter 1 of 17. It would add definitions of "architectural works," "Berne Convention" and "Berne Convention work," to section 101. In the same section, the definition of "pictorial, graphic, and sculptural works" is modified expressly to exclude "architectural works."

In section 5, section 102(a) is amended to add "architectural works" to the list of types of copyrighted works. Although an aspect of the Berne Convention not examined with serious scrutiny by any group, the protection of architectural works appears to be required by the Berne Convention in a fashion not now fully available under title 17. Specifically, while rights holders in two-dimensional architectural plans or blueprints may enjoy copyright protection in such works as considered "pictorial" works, such a copyright has not extended to the exclusive right to control the building of the structure so depicted in three dimensions. The right of an architect to control the construction of his or her

work is therefore given a basis in our Copyright Act by these amendments.

Section 6 of the bill relates to the national origin of Berne Convention works. It amends section 104 of title 17 in two ways: Protection for foreign works is explicitly extended to "Berne Convention works" and the proscription against self-execution is codified. This letter codification is fundamental to the entire question of implementing legislation and of adherence to the convention. It should be absolutely clear that all copyright rights available in courts in the United States must be found exclusively within the provisions of title 17. It should also be clear that State law rights that are not preempted by section 301 are not affected in any way by this legislation or by Berne adherence.

Section 7 sets forth a major change in chapter 1 of the Copyright Act. This change is found in a new section 106a, the "moral rights of the author" section. This section creates important Berne rights in works other than works made for hire. The rights of "paternity" and "integrity," are provided, and are independent of the economic rights in the work. The right of paternity means that authors may claim authorship in their works, independently of any license or conveyance of their copyrights; the right of integrity gives them power to object to any distortion, mutilation, or alteration of their works that would prejudice the author's honor or reputation. Again, such objections could be made by the author even where the author has parted with the copyright. Since the 1950's, when close examination of the moral rights question under United States law began, it has been argued that rights substantially equivalent to moral rights as they exist in States of the Berne Union are provided for in a variety of laws considered together: The Lanham Act, rules of unfair competition, certain of the economic rights under copyright and the common law of the 50 States. There is no doubt that the Berne Convention requires recognition of these rights. The question is whether such rights exist with the degree of national uniformity and predictability which should be provided in order fairly to comply with Berne requirements. I therefore propose a provision recognizing moral rights. While statesmanship and the spirit of political compromise may, in the final reckoning, work a different solution to the moral rights question, I am reluctant to reject at the outset the necessity of recognition of moral rights which may be a great interest to authors and artists, if not to those who deal with their works.

A second major change in current law occurs in the complete revision of section 116, dealing with the jukebox "compulsory license." Section 8 of the bill strikes subsections (a) through (e)

of current law. A new section 116 makes the present jukebox compulsory license system—that seems clearly incompatible with Berne—subordinate to negotiated licenses where such licenses come into force. The new provisions would authorize where such licenses as they come into force and would formalize a negotiating process that could totally supplant the compulsory license. If, after a year, negotiations fail to provide consensual licenses for virtually all music, or if negotiations are terminated at some future date, then a compulsory license substantially the same as that in the present section 116 is "standing by" to ensure that jukebox music will always be available to the public. The Copyright Royalty Tribunal would retain jurisdiction over ratemaking and distribution functions only to the extent that negotiations fail or consensual licenses expire or are terminated. I am aware that the provisions of the Berne Convention do not allow expressly for compulsory licensing of nonbroadcast public performances of music as is done presently in the jukebox business. The outright elimination of the compulsory license would, of course, be a solution. But, the different mixes of antitrust and copyright regulations which exist in the United States and many of the Berne Union's member states may warrant an intermediate position to be taken in the matter. In effect, the system proposed in the bill would condition Government review of voluntary negotiations upon the failure of negotiations—a result which may be fairly analogous to similar sorts of reviews permitted under the laws of Berne countries. In any event, several years ago in my presence, jukebox operators and the performing rights societies entered into an arrangement whereby compliance with the compulsory license provisions can lead to rebates on statutory royalties. In this wholly worthwhile step toward close, voluntary cooperation, both groups have agreed not to propose changes in the compulsory license without consultation. My proposal here is intended to precipitate such consultations, looking toward a balanced solution which preserves the interests of both the groups and those of the consumer in being able to enjoy in small, local, establishments, some reasonably priced popular music.

Section 9 creates a new section 119 of title 17. The new section limits the moral rights granted by new section 106a by providing that they are freely alienable and subject to waiver, in keeping with traditional property doctrine in this country. New section 119, also provides that, unless otherwise provided, traditional editing, adapting, and arranging practices of publishers, broadcasters, motion picture studios, and the like shall not infringe an author's moral rights. Section 9 also sets

forth a new section 120, which clarifies the scope of copyright in architectural works by limiting protection to the artistic character and artistic design of a building, rather than to its processes or methods of construction. New section 120 also permits others to make two-dimensional reproductions of a copyrighted building without infringing the building copyright, when the building is in a location to which the public has access. Even when a building is protected by copyright, remedies for another's construction of an infringing building are limited. If construction of an infringing building has substantially begun, that is, if structural work has been at least partially completed, no injunctive relief will be available to stop construction, nor shall an infringing building be subject to demolition or seizure. Unsaid, but worth noting, is the fact that architectural works would be subject to all of the limitations and exceptions found in the present copyright law, most particularly fair use. Further, owners of buildings embodying architectural works are allowed to modify such structures without fear of violating either the economic or moral rights of the architect, so long as the modifications are minor, or are necessary to enhance the utility of the building.

Section 10 of the bill amends chapter 4 of title 17 in several areas. The intent of all these changes is to make the law with respect to the use of the copyright notice, the registration system, and the system for building the collections of the Library of Congress compatible with Berne while simultaneously doing no more to the present law than is absolutely necessary. The amendments to sections 401 and 402 make use of the copyright notice voluntary—a work will no longer be injected into the public domain at any time because it is first published without notice. At the same time, if a copyright owner elects to use a notice, its form is specified in the law.

A requirement of notice of copyright on copies of published works has been a feature of United States copyright law, in one form or another, for almost 200 years. Many user groups, particularly noncommercial, have come to rely upon the information it provides. Certain commercial users have supported the copyright notice as a means of injecting works into the public domain. There is apparently unanimity as to the necessity of eliminating the copyright notice in order to comply with Berne. My bill, however, assumes that at least on a transitional basis, the informational utility of the notice as a means of conveniently distinguishing the protected from the unprotected is sufficiently great so as to warrant encouraging its use. It is entirely possible that elimination of the

notice formality may not in the end curtail its use. Old habits die hard; it remains useful under the Universal Copyright Convention; and, it is, in all probability, the cheapest deterrent to infringement which a copyright holder may take. The propriety and efficacy of these incentives can be considered in the course of hearings on the bill.

In new section 403, the Copyright Office is given the authority to promulgate regulations concerning how publishers of works consisting in whole or in part of uncopyrightable works of the U.S. Government shall apprise the public of those portions of the work that are in the public domain and therefore freely copiable.

The bill repeals section 404, since no notice whatsoever need appear on a collective work, or on contributions thereto.

Sections 405 and 406, which deal with omissions of and errors in the copyright notice, are amended so as to apply only to works published in the United States—with or without a copyright notice—subject to mandatory deposit in the Library of Congress. This should have little functional effect, since virtually all publications in which the Library is interested now bear a copyright notice, and it seems likely that the Library's compliance activities will remain largely unchanged.

Section 11 of the bill contains a technical amendment to section 407(a) of current law, eliminating the notice requirement.

Section 12 amends section 408 of current law, concerning registration, to delete reference to section 405(a), since "cure" of a publication without notice is no longer necessary, and to further delete subparagraph (c)(2)(A), since the "collective works notice" section has been deleted.

Section 13 of the bill amends chapter 5 of title 17, relating to copyright infringement and remedies. Section 501(a) is amended to reflect the fact that violations of the moral rights provided in new section 106a are not copyright infringements. New section 511 addresses infringements of moral rights and provides that potential remedies include injunctions, actual and statutory damages, and costs and attorney's fees.

Section 14 of the bill amends chapter 8 of title 17, by providing that if the Copyright Royalty Tribunal ever has to adjust jukebox compulsory license fees, it shall give great weight both to its "final" rates prior to implementation of new section 116 and to the rates contained in any new consensual licenses that are negotiated.

Section 15 clarifies that title 17, United States Code, as amended by this act, does not provide copyright protection for any work that is in the public domain in the United States.

Section 16 provides that this act, and any amendments made thereby, shall take effect on the day after the date on which the Berne Convention enters into force with respect to the United States. Section 16 also specifies that any cause of action arising under title 17, United States Code, before the effective date of the act shall be governed by the provisions of such title as in effect when the cause of action arose. In other words, the act is not retroactive.

It may be useful to explain why certain provisions which might have been included in the bill were not. To reiterate, the approach of the legislation is to include, rather than exclude, proposals where the plain meaning of the convention and the practices of Berne Union states—particularly those sharing our legal tradition—appear to require changes in current copyright law. Nonetheless, the elimination or modification of the provisions of the 1976 Copyright Act which govern the renewal of copyrights which were in their first term of protection when the new law came into effect is not proposed. The renewal provisions of the 1976 Copyright Act are essentially transitional in nature; they do not apply to works which acquired copyright protection under Federal law after the effective date of the 1976 act. The renewal system is replaced by the wholly new approach of the 1976 act: A unitary term of protection; and, provisions for the termination of transfers by authors or certain of their successors, after the lapse of a number of years from the date of original assignments.

Consideration was given to eliminating the renewal provisions, even with respect to works then enjoying Federal copyright protection. But a whole set of expectancies, reflected in contracts with authors, with their families, have been embedded in contracts since the turn of the century. Congress maintained the renewal provision for copyrighted works predating the new law in order to respect these contracts and, also, as the Register of Copyrights remarked in 1965, "Most people have recognized that any attempt to improve the language now in effect would compound the present confusion and . . . it would be better to retain the present language which at least has a background of many years of interpretation and practice." [1965 Supplementary Report of the Register on Copyright Law Revision at 95.]

Additionally, the bill does not propose the retroactive protection of works which may have fallen into the U.S. public domain due to reasons other than the expiration of their terms of copyright. There seems to be general agreement among those who have examined the question that article 18 of the Berne Convention leaves

considerable scope to national discretion in dealing with the retroactive protection of the convention. Because the public domain is precisely what it says it is—the common property of the people to use as they see fit, in or out of commerce—I am strongly disinclined to restore controls over this heritage to proprietary interests.

This brief summary, Mr. Speaker, suggests that even under the best of circumstances, Berne adherence faces an uphill climb. I have highlighted some of the dangers off the beaten track, and I urge all of my colleagues to study the bill closely. It could be one of the most historic efforts we undertake in the 100th Congress, or it could be a difficult endeavor to start. Let us commence.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes, on March 17.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO, for 60 minutes, on March 18.

Mr. DEWINE, for 60 minutes, on March 18.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRAY of Illinois) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FAWELL.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. THOMAS of California.

Mr. RINALDO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRAY of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRANK.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.

Mr. BONER of Tennessee in five instances.

Mr. BEILENSEN.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. HOWARD in two instances.

Ms. KAPTUR in two instances.

Mr. LEVINE of California.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 17, 1987, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

866. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

867. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the planning and construction by the Secretary of Agriculture of a facility to provide additional storage space and the renovation of existing facilities to provide laboratories at the National Seed Storage Laboratory, Fort Collins, CO; to the Committee on Agriculture.

868. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting five reports of violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

869. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management and Personnel), transmitting the "Defense Manpower Requirements Report for FY 1988," which in conjunction with Secretary Weinberger's "Annual Report to the Congress for FY 1988," addresses the Department's total manpower resources: Active, Reserve, and retired military personnel and civilian employees; manpower readiness; mobilization; and efforts to improve management, efficiency, and productivity, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 115(b)(3); to the Committee on Armed Services.

870. A letter from the General Counsel of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the U.S. Mint for fiscal years 1988 and 1989, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

871. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend certain Federal laws relating to housing, community and neighborhood development, and related programs, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

872. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, "Review of DAS Contract No. 0110-AA-NS-03-CC With Government

Vending Management Services, Inc.," pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

873. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, "Fiscal Year 1986 Annual Report on Advisory Neighborhood Commissions," pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

874. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Energy Information Administration's (EIA) annual report, which describes the organization, program, and accomplishments of the agency in calendar year 1986, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 790f(a)(2); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

875. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on the experiences of Medicaid recipients in health maintenance organizations, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1396a nt.; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

876. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 01-87, concerning a proposed memorandum of understanding with the Governments of Canada, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Turkey, and the United Kingdom for the cooperative development and production of a 155mm autonomous precision guided munition (APGM), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

877. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

878. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1988 and 1989 for the Department of State, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

879. A letter from the Director, Office of Information Resources Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of an altered Federal records systems, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

880. A letter from the Deputy Director for Administration, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting the agency's report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1986, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

881. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's annual report of activities during calendar year 1986 under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

882. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting notice of a proposed altered Federal records systems, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

883. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's 12th annual report of its activities under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

884. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Board of Regents, Uniformed Services

University of the Health Sciences, transmitting a report of activities under the Government in the Sunshine Act covering March 12, 1986 to March 11, 1987, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

885. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's 1986 annual report on its activities under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

886. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's report during the fiscal year 1986, concerning its activities to ensure that competition in contracting practices are being followed, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 419; to the Committee on Government Operations.

887. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

888. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

889. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting notification of leasing systems, sale 110, for the central Gulf of Mexico, scheduled to be held in April 1987, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(8); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

890. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the status of physical security at the Panama Canal with respect to the threat of international terrorism, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1801 nt.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

891. A letter from the Director of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to reform the civil service retirement system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

892. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to ensure the equitable application of a general schedule alternative plan or other pay limitation to certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

893. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to reform the financing of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

894. A letter from the Special Counsel, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a copy of a report of the Secretary of the Army, setting forth the findings and conclusions of the Secretary's investigation into allegations of fraudulent time and attendance practices and improper use of incentive awards, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1206(b)(5)(A); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

895. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing appropriations

to the Secretary of the Interior for services necessary to the nonperforming arts functions of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

896. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of an amended lease prospectus to acquire 58,840 occupiable square feet of space for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the Philadelphia, PA area, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

897. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the sixth annual report on the Methane Transportation Research, Development and Demonstration Program—fiscal year 1986, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 3808; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

898. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for carrying out the National Climate Program for fiscal years 1988 and 1989; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

899. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the foster care and adoption assistance programs under part E of title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

900. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report, "Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor, 1985," which also fulfills the requirements relating to the Work Incentive Program and that relating to veterans' training and employment activities, pursuant to Public Law 97-300, section 169(d); 42 U.S.C. 640 SSA, section 440; 38 U.S.C. 2007(c); jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Veterans' Affairs.

901. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a supplemental appropriation request for fiscal year 1987, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 437d(d)(1); jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Appropriations.

902. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Secretary's 1985 annual report on the administration of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. App. 1683(a); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

903. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the operation and maintenance of certain fish propagation facilities constructed in the Columbia River basin, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

904. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate implementation of the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Ways and Means.

905. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting notification of the submittal of a draft Proposed Final Oil and Gas Leasing Program for areas offshore California, pursuant to Public Law 99-591; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations, Inte-

rior and Insular Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follow:

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 1157. A bill to provide for an acreage diversion pilot program applicable to the wheat program for the 1987 and 1988 crops; with an amendment (Rept. 100-25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROE (by request):

H.R. 1612. A bill to authorize appropriations under the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 for fiscal years 1988 and 1989; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 1613. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the rate of percentage depletion for oil and gas wells to 27½ percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARCHER (for himself, Mr.

LOTT, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. DELAY, Mr. KEMP, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. LEATH of Texas, and Mr. McEWEN):

H.R. 1614. A bill to encourage the continued exploration for and production of domestic energy resources, to remove certain Federal controls over domestic energy production and utilization, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. GARCIA, and Mrs. BOXER):

H.R. 1615. A bill to establish the Government Information Agency to enhance the economic, scientific, and technological position of the United States by acquiring, processing, and distributing the fruits of federally performed and federally sponsored research, development, and analysis, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations; Rules; and Science, Space, and Technology.

H.R. 1616. A bill to prescribe requirements relating to scientific and technical information used in the performance of contracts awarded by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 1617. A bill to promote U.S. trade in agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs; Agriculture; and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FAUNTROY (for himself and Mr. DELLUMS):

H.R. 1618. A bill to recognize the organization known as the Montford Point Marine Association, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FAWELL (for himself and Mr. GUNDERSON):

H.R. 1619. A bill to improve the quality of teaching in American schools and enhance the competence of American students and thereby strengthen the economic competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRANK (for himself, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. SOLARZ):

H.R. 1620. A bill to establish a Commission To Investigate Federal Involvement With the Immigration of Nazi Collaborators; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

H.R. 1621. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, and National Academy of Engineers, to carry out certain highway research; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. HUCKABY (for himself, Mr.

COELHO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. LOTT, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. TALLON, and Mr. THOMAS of California):

H.R. 1622. A bill to provide that all U.S. cotton producers participate in defraying costs of their research and promotion program and that imported cotton and products be subject to the program assessments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 1623. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to implement the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, as revised at Paris on July 24, 1971, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina:

H.R. 1624. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require that certain revenues attributable to tariffs levied on imports of textile machinery and parts thereof be applied to support research for the modernization of the American textile machinery industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1625. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of trifluoromethylaniline (also known as m-Aminobenzotrifluoride); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 1626. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to establish a program to make grants to States to provide home health services to older individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROE (by request):

H.R. 1627. A bill to amend title II of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1988 and 1989; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMAS of California:

H.R. 1628. A bill to require the updating of the reports submitted in accordance with the Wine Equity and Export Expansion Act of 1984; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution to make a correction, relating to the maximum speed limit, in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 2; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Public Works and Transportation.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. FLORIO, and Mr. RIDGE):

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the Veterans' Administration Home Loan Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. PATTERSON, and Mr. FLORIO):

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the sense of Congress that the 1-percent fee charged by the Veterans' Administration to veterans obtaining a home loan guaranteed by such Administration should not be increased; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PARRIS:

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution reaffirming that deposits, up to the statutorily prescribed amount, in federally insured depository institutions are backed by the full faith and credit of the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.

12. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of Minnesota, relative to the Federal highway program; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. FLORIO, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. SWIFT.

H.R. 21: Mr. FLORIO, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. SWIFT.

H.R. 52: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 74: Mr. SUNIA.

H.R. 118: Mr. DIOGUARDI.

H.R. 164: Mr. WEISS, Mr. ROBINSON, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. ROE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LELAND, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 176: Mr. BRENNAN and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 205: Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 281: Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. DYSON, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 317: Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STARK, Mr. BATES, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 457: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, and Mr. RUSSO.

H.R. 497: Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 578: Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 618: Mr. MINETA, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. GEJENSON, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 628: Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 637: Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 654: Mr. BELENSON.

H.R. 656: Mr. MACKAY.

H.R. 693: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 757: Mr. MCDADE.

H.R. 898: Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 916: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. CRANE, Mr. PETRI, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. WEBER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. RITTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 925: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MAVROULES, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. WOLFE.

H.R. 980: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 1101: Mr. OLIN.

H.R. 1105: Mr. FAZIO and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 1141: Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. SABO, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. PENNY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. ECKART, Mr. RIDGE, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 1188: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 1213: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. HENRY, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. WORTLEY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 1259: Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. COELHO, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. WILSON, Mr.

FAZIO, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. FROST, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. DAUB, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. YATRON, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. DYSON, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1326: Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 1327: Mr. JONES of Tennessee and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 1368: Mr. PETRI.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SIKORSKI, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. TAUZIN.

H.J. Res. 43: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. STUMP, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. WEBER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. FROST, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.J. Res. 62: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.J. Res. 90: Mr. HORTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. DYSON, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 110: Mr. WOLFE, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 155: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. RITTER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. CONTE, Mr. HORTON, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 32: Mr. WOLFE and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H. Res. 17: Mr. COBLE.